arXiv:1510.04930v3 [math.CO] 30 Nov 2015

Linear sequential dynamical systems and the Moebius functions of partially ordered sets

Ricky X. F. Chen[1], Christian M. Reidys[2]

Virginia Bioinformatics Institute and Dept. of Mathematics,
Virginia Tech, 1015 Life Sciences Circle,
Blacksburg, VA 24061, USA

[1]chen.ricky1982@gmail.com, [2]duck@santafe.edu

Abstract. A sequential dynamical system (SDS) consists of a graph, a set of local functions and an update schedule. A linear sequential dynamical system is an SDS whose local functions are linear. In this paper, we obtain a closed formula for the composition of linear local functions according to a given permutation update schedule. We show that any linear system, regardless of update method, can be expressed as a linear SDS and connect linear SDS to the Moebius functions of partially ordered sets. We study linear SDS over update schedules that are words and derive a closed formula for these systems. Finally we prove a cut theorem for the Moebius functions of certain posets based on a decomposition of their chains.

1 Introduction

Modeling discrete processes is an important topic in mathematics as it is of relevance for the understanding of network dynamics [2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 12, 15, 19, 23]. Sequential dynamical systems (SDS[1]) [2, 3, 4, 5, 14] provide such a framework based on a graph, a set of local functions labeled by vertices and an update schedule. SDS were motivated by the work on Cellular Automata (CA) [15, 23] and Boolean Networks [12]. The key question here is to deduce phase space properties from graph, local maps and update schedule.

A sequential dynamical system over a graph involves three ingredients: a (dependency) graph to represent the interaction relations among entities, local functions and an update schedule in order to specify the order of state updates. Note that even though an update schedule is a linear order, the underlying graph, specifically its acyclic orientations is the key observable [4, 5, 16]. In other words, the underlying dependency graph determines the extend of sequentiality of a system.

It is not easy to deduce phase space properties of SDS over general graphs and general local functions with varying update schedules. The question is intriguing though, since

[1]We will write SDS in singular as well as plural form.

sometimes dramatic changes can be induced by "slightly" changing the update schedule, while keeping everything else fixed. In praxis, such changes can inadvertently be introduced when implementing an SDS on a specific computer architecture.

In [1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 13] the reader can find a plethora of results on dynamical systems over particular graphs and updating functions. Linear systems together with a parallel update schedule, i.e. dynamical systems, in which the local functions are linear, were studied in [8, 10, 11].

In [7], linear SDS are studied and a formal composition formula of matrices is obtained, characterizing a linear SDS. We shall improve this result by deriving a simple matrix expression for any linear SDS and show in addition that *any* linear system can be expressed by a linear SDS. We then extend our framework to linear SDS over words, i.e. update schedules in which vertices appear multiple times but at least once. We establish a closed matrix formula for these systems and derive a relation to the Moebius functions of partially ordered sets associated with composing such words.

The paper is organized as follows: in Section 2 we review some basic concepts and facts on SDS. In Section 3 we study linear SDS with permutation update schedules and compute in Theorem 3.1 a matrix that completely describes such a system. Using Theorem 3.1 we prove in Theorem 3.2 that any linear system can be expressed as a linear SDS and characterize in Proposition 3.4 invertibility. We construct in Proposition 3.6 a linear SDS interpretation of the Moebius function of a given partially order set (poset). In Section 4, we extend our results to linear SDS, where the updating schedules are words over all vertices (linear SDS over words). We compute in Theorem 4.1 a closed formula for these, that restricts to Theorem 3.1 proved in Section 3. The concatenation of linear SDS over words gives rise to a relation of the Moebius functions of certain posets and in Theorem 4.2 we prove a cut theorem of these.

2 Linear SDS and the incidence algebra of posets

Let G be a connected, simple graph with vertices set $V(G) = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n\}$. To each vertex, v_i, we associate a state, $x_i \in \mathbb{K}$, where $\mathbb{K}$ is a field. A function f_{v_i} updates the state of v_i based on the states of its neighbors and x_i itself. Let $\pi = \pi_1\pi_2\cdots\pi_m$ be a family of elements in $V(G)$, in which each v_i appears at least once, called the update schedule. The states of all vertices are sequentially updated according to their order in π, i.e., the vertex specified by π_{i+1} is updated after the vertex specified by π_i. Iterating π generates the SDS, (G, f, π), having G as its dependency graph, f_{v_i}, $1 \leq i \leq n$, as local functions, and π as update schedule. We remark that π is a word over $V(G)$, i.e., each vertex is not necessarily getting updated exactly once. In case each vertex appears exactly once π is a permutation.

The vectors $X = [x_1, x_2, \cdots x_n]^T \in \mathbb{K}^n$ are called the system states of the SDS. An SDS update will produce the phase space mapping X_0 into $X_1 = (G, f, \pi)X_0$. To understand the time evolution of the SDS is tantamount to understanding the mapping $(G, f, \pi) : \mathbb{K}^n \to \mathbb{K}^n$, i.e. the unicyclic graph it induces. In case of the system map (G, f, π) being a linear transformation on $\mathbb{K}^n$, the phase space has been studied in [8, 10, 11, 19]

and phase space features were described in terms of the annihilating polynomials and invariant subspaces of the linear transformation. In [7], linear SDS over directed graph were analyzed, allowing for states, x_i, contained in a finite algebra.

Definition 2.1. A linear SDS over the field $\mathbb{K}$ is an SDS (G, f, π) where the local functions are defined by

$$f_{v_i} : x_i \mapsto a_{i1}x_1 + a_{i2}x_2 + \cdots + a_{in}x_n, \tag{1}$$

where $a_{ij} \in \mathbb{K}$ and $a_{ij} = 0$ if v_i and v_j are not adjacent in G.

Note that each local function f_{v_i} induces the function F_{v_i}:

$$F_{v_i} : \mathbb{K}^n \to \mathbb{K}^n, \quad [x_1, \ldots x_i, \ldots x_n] \mapsto [x_1, \ldots f_{v_i}(x_i), \ldots x_n].$$

F_{v_i} can be expressed as a matrix over $\mathbb{K}$ as follows:

$$F_{v_i} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & & \vdots \\ a_{i1} & a_{i2} & a_{i3} & \cdots & a_{in} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{i.e., } [F_{v_i}]_{kj} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } (k = j) \wedge (k \neq i); \\ a_{ij}, & \text{if } k = i; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then, if $X_1 = (G, f, \pi)X_0$, we have

$$X_1 = F_{\pi_n} F_{\pi_{n-1}} \cdots F_{\pi_1} X_0. \tag{2}$$

One first objective in Section 3 will be to derive a closed formula of the composition of these matrices F_{π_i}. Secondly, we study the following question: given a linear transformation, A, does there exist a linear SDS, such that $A = (G, f, \pi)$?

It is well known that a permutation update sequence, π, induces an acyclic orientation of the dependency graph G [4, 5, 16], i.e., the edge between two adjacent vertices v_i and v_j will be oriented from v_i to v_j iff v_i appears after v_j in π. This produces the acyclic orientation, $Acyc(G, \pi)$. It was shown in [4, 5] that $(G, f, \pi_1) = (G, f, \pi_2)$ if $Acyc(G, \pi_1) = Acyc(G, \pi_2)$.

Any acyclic orientation of G determines a partial order among the G-vertices, i.e., a poset. Let us recall some basic facts about posets [20].

A poset is a set P with a binary relation '$\leq$' among the elements in P, where the binary relation satisfies reflexivity, antisymmetry and transitivity. The poset will be denoted by $(P, \leq)$ or P, for short. If two elements x and y satisfy $x \leq y$, we say x and y are comparable. Furthermore, if $x \leq y$ but $x \neq y$, we write $x < y$. A linear extension of a poset P is an arrangement of the elements in P, say $s_{i_1} s_{i_2} \cdots s_{i_n}$, such that $j \leq k$ if $s_{i_j} \leq s_{i_k}$ in P.

Definition 2.2. Given a poset $(P, \leq)$, a (closed) interval $[x, y]$, where $x \leq y$, is the subset $\{z \in P : x \leq z \leq y\}$. A chain of P is a subset of elements such that any two elements there are comparable.

In this paper, we only consider posets $(P, \leq)$, where $|P|$ is finite and we denote $Int(P)$ to be the set of all intervals of the poset $(P, \leq)$. For a function $h : Int(P) \to \mathbb{K}$, we write $h(x, y)$ instead of $h([x, y])$.

Definition 2.3. The incidence algebra $I(P, \mathbb{K})$ of $(P, \leq)$ over $\mathbb{K}$ is the $\mathbb{K}$-algebra of all functions $h : Int(P) \to \mathbb{K}$, where multiplication is defined by

$$hr(x, y) = \sum_{x \leq z \leq y} h(x, z)r(z, y).$$

Suppose $P = \{s_1, s_2, \ldots s_n\}$. The function h can be expressed as a $n \times n$ matrix H where the rows (and columns) of H are indexed by the sequence $s_1 s_2 \cdots s_n$ and entries are equal to the corresponding h-values there, i.e., the (i, j)-th entry

$$[H]_{ij} = \begin{cases} h(s_i, s_j), & \text{if } s_i \leq s_j; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It is easy to check that the corresponding matrix of hr equals HR, where R is the corresponding matrix of the function r. If $HR = RH = I$, H (h) and R (r) are inverse to each other, i.e. we have $H^{-1} = R$ and $R^{-1} = H$. Furthermore, we have

Lemma 2.1. *For $k \geq 1$, we have*

$$[H^k]_{ij} = \sum_{s_i \leq s_{l_1} \leq s_{l_2} \leq \cdots \leq s_{l_{k-1}} \leq s_j} h(s_i, s_{l_1})h(s_{l_1}, s_{l_2}) \cdots h(s_{l_{k-1}}, s_j), \tag{3}$$

$$[(H - \mathrm{Diag}\{H\})^k]_{ij} = \sum_{s_i < s_{l_1} < s_{l_2} < \cdots < s_{l_{k-1}} < s_j} h(s_i, s_{l_1})h(s_{l_1}, s_{l_2}) \cdots h(s_{l_{k-1}}, s_j). \tag{4}$$

Note that we have $[H^k]_{ij} = 0$ and $[(H - \mathrm{Diag}\{H\})^k]_{ij} = 0$ if $v_i \not\leq v_j$, and $[(H - \mathrm{Diag}\{H\})^k]_{ij} = 0$ if $k \geq n$, since there are no chains contributing to the sum, respectively.

3 Linear SDS over permutations and Moebius functions

Let (G, f, π) be a linear SDS, then its local functions, f_{v_i}, can be encoded in the matrix:

$$A = \begin{array}{c} \begin{matrix} v_1 & v_2 & v_3 & \cdots & v_n \end{matrix} \\ \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & a_{13} & \cdots & a_{1n} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & a_{23} & \cdots & a_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ a_{i1} & a_{i2} & a_{i3} & \cdots & a_{in} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ a_{n1} & a_{n2} & a_{n3} & \cdots & a_{nn} \end{pmatrix} \end{array} \begin{matrix} v_1 \\ v_2 \\ \vdots \\ v_i \\ \vdots \\ v_n \end{matrix} \tag{5}$$

and we set $(G, A, \pi) = (G, f, \pi)$. Note, that if all vertices update simultaneously, i.e. we have a parallel dynamical system, the system map is the linear transformation A. We further set $\mathrm{Diag}\{A\} = \mathrm{diag}\{a_{11}, a_{22}, \ldots, a_{nn}\}$ and let $\pi^{[r]} = \pi_n \cdots \pi_2 \pi_1$. The identity matrix is denoted by $I = \mathrm{diag}\{1, 1, \ldots, 1\}$.

Any acyclic orientation, $Acyc(G, \pi)$, induces a poset $(P, \leq)$ as follows:

(a) $P = V(G)$;

(b) $v_i \leq v_j$ if $v_i = v_j$ or there is an edge oriented from v_i to v_j;

(c) the binary relation $\leq$ on P is the transitive closure w.r.t. (b).

Also, the local functions A of the SDS induce a function $h_\pi \in I(P, \mathbb{K})$:

$$h_\pi : Int(P) \to \mathbb{K}, \quad [v_i, v_j] \mapsto a_{ij}.$$

Let H_π be the matrix of h_π and $A_\pi = H_\pi - \mathrm{Diag}\{H_\pi\} = H_\pi - \mathrm{Diag}\{A\}$.

Example 3.1. Let a graph $G = \mathrm{Circ4}$ as shown in Figure 1. For the linear SDS (G, Par, π) where the local functions are the Par function over $\mathbb{F}_2$, we have



Figure 1: The graph $G = \mathrm{Circ4}$.

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad A_{0123} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad A_{3210} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We are now in position to present our first result:

Theorem 3.1. *Let (G, A, π) be a linear SDS. Then,*

$$(G, A, \pi) = (I - A_\pi)^{-1}(A - A_\pi). \tag{6}$$

Proof. First, note that F_{v_i} can be decomposed into $F_{v_i} = I + \bar{F}_{v_i}$, where $\bar{F}_{v_i}$ has nonzero entries only at the i-th row as follows:

$$\bar{F}_{v_i} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ a_{i1} & \cdots & a_{ii} - 1 & \cdots & a_{in} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Accordingly,

$$\begin{aligned}(G, A, \pi) = F_\pi &= F_{\pi_n} F_{\pi_{n-1}} \cdots F_{\pi_1} \\ &= (I + \bar{F}_{\pi_n})(I + \bar{F}_{\pi_{n-1}}) \cdots (I + \bar{F}_{\pi_1}) = I + \sum_{m=1}^{n} \sum_{n \geq k_m > \cdots > k_1 \geq 1} \bar{F}_{\pi_{k_m}} \cdots \bar{F}_{\pi_{k_1}}. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

We shall consider the value of the (i, j)-th entry $[F_\pi]_{ij}$ of F_π. Let $s = (s_1, s_2, \cdots, s_k)$ be a sequence. If $s' = (s_{i_1}, s_{i_2}, \cdots, s_{i_j})$ is a subsequence of s, we write $s' \lhd s$.

Claim 1. For $1 \leq m, i, j \leq n$, we have

$$\left[\sum_{n \geq k_m > \cdots > k_1 \geq 1} \bar{F}_{\pi_{k_m}} \cdots \bar{F}_{\pi_{k_1}} \right]_{ij} = \sum_{v_{l_{m-1}} v_{l_{m-2}} \cdots v_{l_1} v_i \lhd \pi} [\bar{F}_{v_i}]_{i l_1} [\bar{F}_{v_{l_1}}]_{l_1 l_2} \cdots [\bar{F}_{v_{l_{m-1}}}]_{l_{m-1} j}. \tag{8}$$

To prove the claim, we observe

$$\left[\sum_{n \geq k_m > \cdots > k_1 \geq 1} \bar{F}_{\pi_{k_m}} \cdots \bar{F}_{\pi_{k_1}} \right]_{ij} = \sum_{n \geq k_m > \cdots > k_1 \geq 1} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq l_t \leq n \\ 1 \leq t \leq m-1}} [\bar{F}_{\pi_{k_m}}]_{i l_1} [\bar{F}_{\pi_{k_{m-1}}}]_{l_1 l_2} \cdots [\bar{F}_{\pi_{k_2}}]_{l_{m-2} l_{m-1}} [\bar{F}_{\pi_{k_1}}]_{l_{m-1} j}.$$

Note, if $\pi_{k_m} \neq v_i$, then $[\bar{F}_{\pi_{k_m}}]_{i l_1} = 0$. Similarly, for $1 \leq t \leq m-1$, if $\pi_{k_{m-t}} \neq v_{l_t}$, then $[\bar{F}_{\pi_{k_{m-t}}}]_{l_t l_{t+1}} = 0$. Thus, the RHS can be reduced to

$$\sum_{v_{l_{m-1}} v_{l_{m-2}} \cdots v_{l_1} v_i \lhd \pi} [\bar{F}_{v_i}]_{i l_1} [\bar{F}_{v_{l_1}}]_{l_1 l_2} \cdots [\bar{F}_{v_{l_{m-2}}}]_{l_{m-2} l_{m-1}} [\bar{F}_{v_{l_{m-1}}}]_{l_{m-1} j},$$

whence Claim 1.

Claim 2. For $1 \le m, i, j \le n$, we have

$$\left[\sum_{n \ge k_m > \cdots > k_1 \ge 1} \bar{F}_{\pi_{k_m}} \cdots \bar{F}_{\pi_{k_1}}\right]_{ij} = [A_\pi^{m-1}(A-I)]_{ij}. \tag{9}$$

Note if v_i and v_{l_1} are adjacent in G, v_i appearing after v_{l_1} implies $v_i < v_{l_1}$ in the induced poset. Thus, $[\bar{F}_{v_i}]_{il_1}$ is either equal to $h_\pi(v_i, v_{l_1})$ or 0 depending on v_i and v_{l_1} being adjacent or not. The same holds for $[\bar{F}_{v_{l_t}}]_{l_t l_{t+1}}$ for all $1 \le t \le m-2$. Therefore, the RHS of eq. (8) equals to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{1 \le l_{m-1} \le n} \left(\sum_{v_i < v_{l_1} < \cdots < v_{l_{m-1}}} h_\pi(v_i, v_{l_1}) h_\pi(v_{l_1}, v_{l_2}) \cdots h_\pi(v_{l_{m-2}}, v_{l_{m-1}}) \right) [\bar{F}_{v_{l_{m-1}}}]_{l_{m-1} j} \\
&= \sum_{1 \le l_{m-1} \le n} [A_\pi^{m-1}]_{i l_{m-1}} [\bar{F}_{v_{l_{m-1}}}]_{l_{m-1} j},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from Lemma 2.1, namely for fixed i and l_{m-1},

$$\sum_{v_i < v_{l_1} < \cdots < v_{l_{m-1}}} h(v_i, v_{l_1}) h(v_{l_1}, v_{l_2}) \cdots h(v_{l_{m-2}}, v_{l_{m-1}}) = [A_\pi^{m-1}]_{i l_{m-1}}.$$

Consequently we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left[\sum_{n \ge k_m > \cdots > k_1 \ge 1} \bar{F}_{\pi_{k_m}} \cdots \bar{F}_{\pi_{k_1}}\right]_{ij} &= \sum_{1 \le l_{m-1} \le n} [A_\pi^{m-1}]_{i l_{m-1}} [\bar{F}_{v_{l_{m-1}}}]_{l_{m-1} j} \\
&= \sum_{1 \le l_{m-1} \le n} [A_\pi^{m-1}]_{i l_{m-1}} [A-I]_{l_{m-1} j} \\
&= [A_\pi^{m-1}(A-I)]_{ij},
\end{aligned}$$

completing the proof of Claim 2.

Summing over all $1 \le m \le n$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
F_\pi &= I + (A-I) + A_\pi(A-I) + A_\pi^2(A-I) + \cdots + A_\pi^{n-1}(A-I) \\
&= I + (I + A_\pi + A_\pi^2 + \cdots + A_\pi^{n-1})(A-I).
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we observe that

$$(I - A_\pi)(I + A_\pi + A_\pi^2 + \cdots + A_\pi^{n-1}) = I - A_\pi^n. \tag{10}$$

According to Lemma 2.1, $A_\pi^n = 0$ since there is no chain of size larger than n in a poset with n elements. Thus, we obtain $I + A_\pi + A_\pi^2 + \cdots + A_\pi^{n-1} = (I - A_\pi)^{-1}$. Hence,

$$F_\pi = I + (I - A_\pi)^{-1}(A - I) = (I - A_\pi)^{-1}(A - A_\pi),$$

completing the proof of the theorem. □

Theorem 3.2. *Any linear dynamical system is equal to a linear SDS.*

Proof. It is well known that any square matrix T has a LUP decomposition [21, 22], i.e., there exists a permutation matrix P, a lower triangular matrix L and an upper triangular matrix U such that $PT = LU$. By construction the matrix PT is obtained from T by reordering of the rows. Recall a linear dynamical system is a linear system with parallel updating and the system map equals a matrix where its rows are the local functions. Clearly, different orderings of the local functions (into rows) can be easily converted to each other, thus has no effect on understanding the system dynamics. Accordingly, we may assume that the matrix of a linear system, T, has w.l.o.g. the property $T = LU$. Then, in particular, there exists a unitary (i.e., all diagonal entries are 1) lower triangular matrix L and an upper triangular matrix U such that $T = LU$ [22].

We can thus w.l.o.g. assume that the system map T of a given linear dynamical system has rows and columns indexed by the sequence $v_1v_2\cdots v_n$ and $T = LU$ with L being unitary. Then L is invertible, its inverse being a lower triangular matrix having only 1 entries on its diagonal. As a result there exists a lower triangular matrix, A, having 0 as diagonal entries, such that $(I - A)^{-1} = L$.

Claim. T is induced by the linear SDS $(G, U + A, \pi)$, where

(a) the dependency graph G is determined by $U + A$, namely if $(U + A)_{ij} \neq 0$, then v_i and v_j are adjacent in G and not adjacent otherwise,

(b) $\pi = v_1v_2\cdots v_n$.

To prove the Claim we observe that $v_n < v_{n-1} < \cdots < v_1$ (via π), implies that $(U + A)_\pi$ is a lower triangular matrix in which all diagonal entries are 0. By construction we then have $(U + A)_\pi = A$ and we arrive at

$$(G, (U + A), \pi) = (I - A)^{-1}((U + A) - A) = LU = T,$$

completing the proof of the theorem. □

With the notation of Theorem 3.2 we have:

Corollary 3.3. *A square matrix is induced by a linear SDS if and only if it has a LU decomposition.*

An SDS is called invertible if the map $(G, f, \pi) : \mathbb{K}^n \to \mathbb{K}^n$ is invertible. Theorem 3.2 implies that if we have an invertible, linear SDS, its inverse is again a linear SDS. In particular

Proposition 3.4. *Let (G, A, π) be a linear SDS, having A as matrix of local functions and $D = Diag\{A\}$. Then (G, A, π) is invertible iff $a_{ii} \neq 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ and*

$$(G, A, \pi)^{-1} = (G, B, \pi^{[r]}), \tag{11}$$

where $B_{\pi^{[r]}} = -D^{-1}A_{\pi^{[r]}}$ and $B_\pi = -D^{-1}A_\pi$ and $Diag\{B\} = D^{-1}$.

Proof. Invertibility follows from the invertibility of the maps F_{v_i} which is easily checked when considering their matrix representation. The matrix of the linear SDS $(G, B, \pi^{[r]})$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}(I-(-D^{-1}A)_{\pi^{[r]}})^{-1}(D^{-1}+(-D^{-1}A)_{\pi}) &= (I+D^{-1}A_{\pi^{[r]}})^{-1}D^{-1}(I-A_{\pi}) \\ &= [(I-A_{\pi})^{-1}(D+A_{\pi^{[r]}})]^{-1},\end{aligned}$$

which is the inverse of (G, A, π). □

Remark 3.5. In view of $(I-A_\pi)^{-1}(A-A_\pi) = (I-A_\pi)^{-1}(\mathrm{Diag}\{A\}+A_{\pi^{[r]}})$, $(I-A_\pi)^{-1} \in I(P,\mathbb{K})$ and $Diag(A)+A_{\pi^{[r]}}$ can be considered as a function in the incidence algebra over the poset having the reverse order.

Proposition 3.6. *Let P be a poset over $\{s_1,\ldots,s_n\}$. For any $H \in I(P,\mathbb{K})$ such that $H_{ii}=1$ for $1 \le i \le n$, there exists a linear SDS whose matrix equals H^{-1}.*

Proof. Any $H \in I(P,\mathbb{K})$ satisfies $H_{ij}=0$ if $s_i > s_j$. We construct the SDS as follows:

Step 1. define a graph G having $\{s_1,\ldots,s_n\}$ as vertices and an G-edge is placed connecting s_i and s_j, iff they are comparable in P,

Step 2. let x_i denote the state of the G-vertex s_i. Define

$$f_{s_i} : x_i \mapsto a_{i1}x_1 + a_{i2}x_2 + \cdots + a_{in}x_n,$$

where $a_{ii}=1$, $a_{ij} = -H_{ij} = -h(s_i,s_j)$ if $s_i < s_j$ in P, set $a_{ij}=0$ otherwise,

Step 3. choose the update schedule $\pi = \pi_1\pi_2\cdots\pi_n$ such that $\pi^{[r]}$ is an arbitrary, linear extension of $(P,\le)$.

Claim. The matrix of the linear SDS (G, A, π) is H^{-1}.

To prove the Claim we observe $I-A_\pi = H$ and $A_{\pi^{[r]}}=0$, and compute via Theorem 3.1

$$(G,A,\pi) = (I-A_\pi)^{-1}(\mathrm{Diag}\{A\}+A_{\pi^{[r]}}) = H^{-1}I = H^{-1}.$$

This proves the proposition. □

Remark 3.7. A particularly interesting function in $I(P,\mathbb{K})$ is the Moebius function μ, the inverse of the zeta function, $\zeta \in I(P,\mathbb{K})$, $\zeta(x,y)=1$, for any $x \le y$ in P and we can compute the Moebius function μ of any poset by Proposition 3.6 via a linear SDS.

4 Linear SDS over words and a cut theorem of posets

In this section, we study the linear SDS over words [9, 17, 18].

Suppose $\omega = w_1w_2\cdots w_m$ is a word of G-vertices, where v_i appears $|\omega|_{v_i} = m_i \ge 1$ times. Clearly, we have $m = \sum_i m_i \ge n$. Note that two adjacent vertices v_i and v_j may appear in ω in the pattern $v_i,\ldots v_j,\ldots v_i,\ldots$. This prevents us from directly working on a poset determined by some acyclic orientation of G. In order to remedy this we proceed as follows:

Definition 4.1. Given a matrix $T_{n\times n} = [t_{ij}]$ and a sequence $s = (m_1, \cdots, m_n)$, where $\sum_k m_k = m, m_k \geq 1$. The block-expansion of (T, s) is the matrix, ${}^e(T, s)$, obtained from T replacing the entry t_{ij} for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ by a $m_i \times m_j$ matrix with all entries being equal to t_{ij}.

Definition 4.2. Given a matrix $T_{m\times m} = [t_{ij}]$ and a sequence $s = (m_1, \cdots, m_n)$, where $\sum_k m_k = m, m_k \geq 1$. The block-compression of (T, s) is the matrix, ${}^c(T, s)$, obtained from T by replacing the block in T bounded by the $(\sum_{k<r} m_k + 1)$-th row, the $(\sum_{k\leq r} m_k)$-th row, the $(\sum_{k<l} m_k + 1)$-th column and the $(\sum_{k\leq l} m_k)$-th column, by the sum over all the entries in the block for all $1 \leq r, l \leq n$, where m_0 is assumed to be 0.

Definition 4.3. Let T be a $n \times n$ matrix, where the rows and columns are both indexed by $v_1 v_2 \dots v_n$. Let π be a linear arrangement of the elements v_i's. Then, the matrix T_π is defined by

$$[T_\pi]_{ij} = \begin{cases} [T]_{ij}, & \text{if } v_i \text{ appears after } v_j \text{ in } \pi; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Theorem 4.1. *Let (G, A, ω) be a linear SDS over a word $\omega = w_1 w_2 \cdots w_m$ where $|\omega|_{v_i} = m_i \geq 1$ and $s = (m_1, m_2, \dots m_n)$. Furthermore, let $B = {}^e(A - I, s)$ be a matrix with both rows and columns indexed by $u_1 u_2 \dots u_m$ and $\bar{\omega} = \bar{w}_1 \bar{w}_2 \cdots \bar{w}_m$ be a sequence on u_i's, obtained by substituting the k-th appearance of v_i in ω by $u_{\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} m_j + k}$. Then,*

$$(G, A, \omega) = I + {}^c((I - B_{\bar{\omega}})^{-1}, s)(A - I). \tag{12}$$

Proof. First we have

$$\begin{aligned}(G, A, \omega) = F_{w_m} F_{w_{m-1}} \cdots F_{w_1} &= (I + \bar{F}_{w_m})(I + \bar{F}_{w_{m-1}}) \cdots (I + \bar{F}_{w_1}) \\ &= I + \sum_{l=1}^{m} \sum_{m \geq k_l > \cdots > k_1 \geq 1} \bar{F}_{w_{k_l}} \cdots \bar{F}_{w_{k_1}}.\end{aligned}$$

Let $s = s_1 s_2 \cdots s_k$ be a sequence. If $s' = s_{i1} s_{i2} \cdots s_{ij}$ is a subsequence of s, we write $s' \lhd s$.

Claim 1. For $l \geq 1$, $n \geq i, j \geq 1$,

$$\Big[\sum_{m \geq k_l > \cdots > k_1 \geq 1} \bar{F}_{w_{k_l}} \cdots \bar{F}_{w_{k_1}} \Big]_{ij} = \sum_{v_{d_1} \cdots v_{d_{l-1}} v_i \lhd \omega} [\bar{F}_{v_i}]_{i d_{l-1}} [\bar{F}_{v_{d_{l-1}}}]_{d_{l-1} d_{l-2}} \cdots [\bar{F}_{v_{d_1}}]_{d_1 j}, \tag{13}$$

where the summation on the RHS is over all length-l subsequences ending with v_i in ω (note here and in the following, a subsequence may appear multiple times due to the multiplicity of vertices in ω), and interpreted as $\sum_{v_i \in \omega} [\bar{F}_{v_i}]_{ij}$, i.e. summation over all occurrence of v_i, for $l = 1$. The LHS of eq. (13) is formally equal to a summation over all subsequences of length l. It reduces to the RHS by the argument given by Claim 1 in Theorem 3.1, the difference being that some vertices may appear multiple times in a subsequence.

Claim 2. For $l \geq 1$, $n \geq i, k \geq 1$,

$$\sum_{v_k v_{j_1} \cdots v_{j_{l-1}} v_i \lhd \omega} [\bar{F}_{v_i}]_{i j_{l-1}} [\bar{F}_{v_{j_{l-1}}}]_{j_{l-1} j_{l-2}} \cdots [\bar{F}_{v_{j_1}}]_{j_1 k} = [\ ^c(B^l_{\bar{\omega}}, s)]_{ik}. \tag{14}$$

Note that the summation of the LHS of eq. (14) is over all length-$(l+1)$ subsequences starting with v_k and ending with v_i in ω. Fixing an occurrence of v_i and v_k in ω (e.g., the leftmost pair of v_i and v_k in the following illustration),

$$\begin{array}{lccccccccccc} v\text{-sequence } \omega: & w_1 & w_2 & \cdots & v_k & \cdots & v_i & \cdots & v_k & \cdots & v_i & \cdots & w_{m-1} & w_m \\ & & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & & & & & & \\ u\text{-sequence } \bar{\omega}: & \bar{w}_1 & \bar{w}_2 & \cdots & u_q & \cdots & u_p & \cdots & u_{\bar{q}} & \cdots & u_{\bar{p}} & \cdots & \bar{w}_{m-1} & \bar{w}_m \end{array}$$

we compute the summation over all length-$(l+1)$ subsequences starting with this v_k and ending with this v_i: fixing a subsequence $v_k v_{j_1} \cdots v_{j_{l-1}} v_i$ in ω, this subsequence corresponds to a subsequence $u_q u_{j'_1} \cdots u_{j'_{l-1}} u_p$ in $\bar{\omega}$. Let R_{u_i} be the matrix induced by the row indexed by u_i in B, in analogy to the construction of F_{v_i} induced by the i-th row of A. Let $R_{u_i} = I + \bar{R}_{u_i}$. Then, by construction

$$[\bar{F}_{v_i}]_{i j_{l-1}} [\bar{F}_{v_{j_{l-1}}}]_{j_{l-1} j_{l-2}} \cdots [\bar{F}_{v_{j_1}}]_{j_1 k} = [\bar{R}_{u_p}]_{p j'_{l-1}} [\bar{R}_{u_{j'_{l-1}}}]_{j'_{l-1} j'_{l-2}} \cdots [\bar{R}_{u_{j'_1}}]_{j'_1 q}.$$

Thus, the summation over all length-$(l+1)$ subsequences starting with this v_k and ending with this v_i is tantamount to summing over all length-$(l+1)$ subsequences starting with u_q and ending with u_p in $\bar{\omega}$, that is

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\substack{v_k v_{j_1} \cdots v_{j_{l-1}} v_i \lhd \omega \\ v_k \to u_q, v_i \to u_p}} [\bar{F}_{v_i}]_{i j_{l-1}} [\bar{F}_{v_{j_{l-1}}}]_{j_{l-1} j_{l-2}} \cdots [\bar{F}_{v_{j_1}}]_{j_1 k} \\ &\qquad = \sum_{u_q u_{j'_1} \cdots u_{j'_{l-1}} u_p \lhd \bar{\omega}} [\bar{R}_{u_p}]_{p j'_{l-1}} [\bar{R}_{u_{j'_{l-1}}}]_{j'_{l-1} j'_{l-2}} \cdots [\bar{R}_{u_{j'_1}}]_{j'_1 q} = [B^l_{\bar{\omega}}]_{pq}, \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

where the last equation follows from Lemma 2.1, in view of the fact that $\bar{\omega}$ induces a partial order on u-elements such that $u_p < u_{j'_{l-1}} < u_{j'_{l-2}} < \cdots < u_1 < u_q$.

To prove Claim 2, we sum over all pairs of v_i, v_k such that v_i appear after v_k in ω on the LHS of eq. (15), which implies summing over all p, q such that u_p is a substitution of v_i, u_q is a substitution of v_k, and u_p appears after u_q in $\bar{\omega}$ on the RHS of eq. (15). Note if p, q are such a pair for the latter, then $[B^l_{\bar{\omega}}]_{qp} = 0$ as there is no chain (of length $l+1$) directed from u_q to u_p in the partial order induced by $\bar{\omega}$, thus the latter equals to summing over all p, q such that u_p is a substitution of v_i and u_q is a substitution of v_k in $\bar{\omega}$. By construction, all m_k and m_i u elements corresponding to v_k and v_i, respectively are consecutively arranged in B (thus $B^l_{\bar{\omega}}$), whence the summation over all p, q means to sum over a $m_i \times m_k$ blocks in $B^l_{\bar{\omega}}$. Accordingly, we arrive at

$$\sum_{\substack{1 \leq p,\, q \leq m \\ v_p, \text{ a subst. of } v_i \\ v_q, \text{ a subst. of } v_k}} [B^l_{\bar{\omega}}]_{pq} = [\ ^c(B^l_{\bar{\omega}}, s)]_{ik},$$

and Claim 2 is proved.

Applying Claim 1 and Claim 2, we compute

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big[\sum_{m\geq k_l>\cdots>k_1\geq 1} \bar{F}_{w_{k_l}}\cdots\bar{F}_{w_{k_1}}\Big]_{ij}\\
&=\sum_{v_{d_1}\cdots v_{d_{l-1}}v_i\lhd\omega}[\bar{F}_{v_i}]_{id_{l-1}}[\bar{F}_{v_{d_{l-1}}}]_{d_{l-1}d_{l-2}}\cdots[\bar{F}_{v_{d_1}}]_{d_1 j}\\
&=\sum_{d_1=1}^{n}\left(\sum_{v_{d_1}\cdots v_{d_{l-1}}v_i\lhd\omega}[\bar{F}_{v_i}]_{id_{l-1}}[\bar{F}_{v_{d_{l-1}}}]_{d_{l-1}d_{l-2}}\cdots[\bar{F}_{v_{d_2}}]_{d_2 d_1}\right)[\bar{F}_{v_{d_1}}]_{d_1 j}\\
&=\sum_{d_1=1}^{n}[\ {}^c(B^{l-1}_{\bar{\omega}},s)]_{id_1}[A-I]_{d_1 j}\\
&=[\ {}^c(B^{l-1}_{\bar{\omega}},s)(A-I)]_{ij}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$(G,A,\omega)=I+\ {}^c(B^0_{\bar{\omega}},s)(A-I)+\ {}^c(B^1_{\bar{\omega}},s)(A-I)+\cdots+\ {}^c(B^{m-1}_{\bar{\omega}},s)(A-I).$$

In view of ${}^c(A,s)+\ {}^c(B,s)=\ {}^c(A+B,s)$, we observe

$${}^c(B^0_{\bar{\omega}},s)+\ {}^c(B^1_{\bar{\omega}},s)+\cdots+\ {}^c(B^{m-1}_{\bar{\omega}},s)=\ {}^c(B^0_{\bar{\omega}}+B^1_{\bar{\omega}}+\cdots+B^{m-1}_{\bar{\omega}},s).$$

Since $B^0_{\bar{\omega}}+B^1_{\bar{\omega}}+\cdots+B^{m-1}_{\bar{\omega}}=(I-B_{\bar{\omega}})^{-1}$ we obtain

$$(G,A,\omega)=I+\ {}^c((I-B_{\bar{\omega}})^{-1},s)(A-I),$$

completing the proof of the theorem. □

Example 4.4. Consider the SDS (G,Par,ω) where $G=\mathrm{Circ4}$ and the updating schedule $\omega=013120321$. Following the construction, $\bar{\omega}=u_1u_3u_8u_4u_6u_2u_9u_7u_5$ and $s=(2,3,2,2)$.

$$A=\begin{pmatrix}1&1&0&1\\1&1&1&0\\0&1&1&1\\1&0&1&1\end{pmatrix},\quad B=\ {}^e(A,s)=\left(\begin{array}{cc:ccc:cc:cc}1&1&1&1&1&0&0&1&1\\1&1&1&1&1&0&0&1&1\\\hdashline1&1&1&1&1&1&1&0&0\\1&1&1&1&1&1&1&0&0\\1&1&1&1&1&1&1&0&0\\\hdashline0&0&1&1&1&1&1&1&1\\0&0&1&1&1&1&1&1&1\\\hdashline1&1&0&0&0&1&1&1&1\\1&1&0&0&0&1&1&1&1\end{array}\right),$$

$$B_{\bar{\omega}} = \left(\begin{array}{cc:cccc:cc:cc} 0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0\\ 1&0&1&1&0&0&0&1&0&\\ \hdashline 1&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&\\ 1&0&1&0&0&0&0&0&0&\\ 1&1&1&1&0&1&1&0&0&\\ \hdashline 0&0&1&1&0&0&0&1&0&\\ 0&0&1&1&0&1&0&1&1&\\ \hdashline 1&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&\\ 1&1&0&0&0&1&0&1&0& \end{array}\right), \quad (I-B_{\bar{\omega}})^{-1} = \left(\begin{array}{cc:cccc:cc:cc} 1&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&\\ 1&1&0&1&0&0&0&1&0&\\ \hdashline 1&0&1&0&0&0&0&0&0&\\ 0&0&1&1&0&0&0&0&0&\\ 0&0&0&1&1&1&1&1&1&\\ \hdashline 0&0&0&1&0&1&0&1&0&\\ 1&1&0&0&0&0&1&1&1&\\ \hdashline 1&0&0&0&0&0&0&1&0&\\ 1&1&0&0&0&1&0&1&1& \end{array}\right).$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}(G,A,\omega) &= I + {}^c((I-B_{\bar{\omega}})^{-1},s)(A-I)\\ &= I + \begin{pmatrix} 1&1&0&1\\ 1&1&0&0\\ 0&1&0&1\\ 1&0&1&1 \end{pmatrix}(A-I).\end{aligned}$$

Theorem 4.1 has implications for the incidence algebra of certain posets and we will show that it gives rise to a cut theorem of posets expressed in terms of their Moebius functions.

Assume ω is the concatenation of two words ω_1 and ω_2, i.e., $\omega = \omega_1\omega_2$, such that each G-vertex appears at least once in both. Then we have $(G,A,\omega) = (G,A,\omega_2)\circ(G,A,\omega_1)$. Theorem 4.1, implies

$$\begin{aligned} I + {}^c&((I-B_{\bar{\omega}})^{-1},s)(A-I)\\ &= (I + {}^c((I-B_{\bar{\omega}_2})^{-1},s_2)(A-I))(I + {}^c((I-B_{\bar{\omega}_1})^{-1},s_1)(A-I)), \quad (16)\end{aligned}$$

where s, s_1 and s_2 encode the multiplicities of the vertices appearing in ω, ω_1 and ω_2, respectively.

A matrix of the form $I - T_\pi$ can always be interpreted as an element in $I(P,\mathbb{K})$. Thus, eq. (16) represents a relation between three posets induced by ω, ω_1 and ω_2, respectively. If $I - B_{\bar{\omega}}$, $I - B_{\bar{\omega_1}}$ and $I - B_{\bar{\omega_2}}$ are the zeta functions of the corresponding posets, then eq. (16) expresses a relation of the corresponding Moebius functions.

Given a graph G and a word $\omega = w_1w_2\cdots w_m$, where $|\omega|_{v_i} = m_i \geq 1$, we introduce the graph G_ω with $V(G_\omega) = \{u_1, u_2, \ldots u_m\}$ via the following data:

- a mapping $\phi : V(G_\omega) \to V(G)$, where $\phi^{-1}(v_i) = \{u_{m_{i-1}+1}, \ldots, u_{m_{i-1}+m_i}\}$,
- u_i and u_j are adjacent in G_ω if $\phi(u_i)$ and $\phi(u_j)$ are adjacent in G, or if $\phi(u_i) = \phi(u_j)$.

Let $\bar{\omega}$ be defined as in Theorem 4.1. Then, $\bar{\omega}$ determines an acyclic orientation of G_ω, i.e. a poset P, and the matrix $I - B_{\bar{\omega}} \in I(P,\mathbb{K})$. Furthermore, all u-elements that map into a fixed v form a G_ω-clique, representing a particular P-chain, which we call a clique-chain. Given two clique-chains C_1 and C_2, if there exist two comparable elements $x \in C_1$ and $y \in C_2$, then all elements of C_1 and C_2 are pairwise comparable.

This above construction gives rise to three graphs, G_ω, G_{ω_1} and G_{ω_2}. The identity $\omega = \omega_1\omega_2$ implies that G_{ω_1} and G_{ω_2} can naturally be considered as subgraphs of G_ω, such that any P_ω clique-chain $C = (\xi_1 < \xi_2 \cdots < \xi_s)$ is cut into the two clique chains $(\xi_1 < \xi_2 \cdots < \xi_{h(C)})$ and $(\xi_{h(C)+1} < \xi_{h(C)+2} \cdots < \xi_s)$. The latter are elements in the posets $P_2(\omega_2)$ and $P_1(\omega_1)$, respectively. By construction, the acyclic orientations on G_{ω_i}, that are determined by $\bar{\omega}_i$ are compatible with $Acyc(G_\omega, \bar{\omega})$. Thus, P_i is a sub-poset of P, and all elements in P_2 are smaller than P_1-elements in P, if they are comparable.

Example 4.5. Consider the graph $G = \text{Circ4}$ and the updating schedule $\omega = 013120321$. Following the construction introduced above, the graph G_ω is as shown in Figure 2 and $\bar{\omega} = u_1u_3u_8u_4u_6u_2u_9u_7u_5$. Let $\omega_1 = 01312$ and $\omega_2 = 0321$. Accordingly, $\bar{\omega}_1 = u_1u_3u_8u_4u_6$ and $\bar{\omega}_2 = u_2u_9u_7u_5$. The graph G_{ω_1} is the subgraph induced by the vertices u_1, u_3, u_8, u_4, u_6 while G_{ω_2} is the subgraph induced by the rest of vertices.



Figure 2: The graph constructed from Circ4 and $\omega = 013120321$.

Definition 4.6. Let $(P, \leq)$ be a poset. A chain-partition $\mathcal{C}$ of P is a collection of mutually disjoint chains $C_1, C_2, \ldots C_n$ such that $\bigcup_i C_i = P$, and if $x \in C_i$ and $y \in C_j$ are comparable, then all elements in C_i and C_j are comparable.

Definition 4.7. Suppose $\mathcal{C} = \{C_1, C_2, \ldots C_n\}$ is a chain-partition of P. A $\mathcal{C}$-cut of P is a cut of each $C_i = (\xi_1 < \xi_2 \cdots < \xi_s)$ into $C_i^{low} = (\xi_1 < \xi_2 \cdots < \xi_{h(i)})$ and $C_i^{up} = (\xi_{h(i)+1} < \xi_{h(i)+2} \cdots < \xi_s)$ such that elements in C_i^{low} are smaller than C_j^{up} if comparable.

Any $\mathcal{C}$-cut of P induces the sub-posets P^{low} and P^{up}, in which $\mathcal{C}^{low} = \{C_1^{low}, \ldots C_n^{low}\}$ and $\mathcal{C}^{up} = \{C_1^{up}, \ldots C_n^{up}\}$ are P^{low} and P^{up} chain-coverings, respectively. See Figure 3 for an example.

Suppose $(P, \leq)$ admits a chain-partition $\mathcal{C} = \{C_1, \ldots C_n\}$, where $C_i = (s_{i1}, s_{i2}, \ldots, s_{im_i})$ and $s_{ij} < s_{i(j+1)}$. Let U be the matrix of the Moebius function of P with the rows and columns indexed by $s_{11} \ldots s_{1m_1} s_{21} \ldots s_{2m_2} \ldots s_{n1} \ldots s_{nm_n}$.

Assume some $\mathcal{C}$-cut leads to P^{low} and P^{up}, such that for each C_i,

$$\begin{aligned} C_i^{low} &= \{s_{i1}, s_{i2}, \ldots s_{im_i'}\}, \\ C_i^{up} &= \{s_{im_i'+1}, s_{im_i'+2}, \ldots s_{im_i}\}. \end{aligned}$$



Figure 3: Making a cut on each chain (vertical dashed line) of P leads to the upper sub-poset P_2 and the lower sub-poset P_1, where all elements in P_1 are assumed to be smaller than those in P_2 if comparable although the corresponding arrows are not shown here.

Let U^{low} be the matrix of the Moebius function of P^{low} with the rows and columns being indexed by

$$s_{11}\dots s_{1m_1'}s_{21}\dots s_{2m_2'}\dots s_{n1}\dots s_{nm_n'}$$

and U^{up} be the matrix of the Moebius function of P^{up} with the rows and columns indexed by

$$s_{1(m_1'+1)}\dots s_{1m_1}s_{2(m_2'+1)}\dots s_{2m_2}\dots s_{n(m_n'+1)}\dots s_{nm_n}.$$

Let $G_{\mathcal{C}}$ be the $\mathcal{C}$-graph of P, having the chains C_i as vertices and in which C_i and C_j are adjacent if their respective elements are comparable. Let J_0 be the adjacency matrix of the $\mathcal{C}$-graph indexed by $C_1C_2\dots C_n$, i.e., $[J_0]_{ij}=1$ if C_i and C_j $(i\neq j)$ are adjacent in $G_{\mathcal{C}}$, $[J_0]_{ij}=0$, otherwise.

Theorem 4.2. *Let $(P,\leq)$ be a poset having the chain-partition $\mathcal{C}$ and a $\mathcal{C}$-cut. Let $s=(m_1,m_2,\dots m_n)$, $s^{low}=(m_1',m_2',\dots m_n')$, $s^{up}=(m_1'',m_2'',\dots m_n'')$, where $m_i'+m_i''=m_i$ and $J=I+J_0$. Then we have*

$$^c(U,s)J = {}^c(U^{low},s^{low})J + {}^c(U^{up},s^{up})J - {}^c(U^{low},s^{low})J\ {}^c(U^{up},s^{up})J. \tag{17}$$

In particular, if J is invertible,

$$^c(U,s) = {}^c(U^{low},s^{low}) + {}^c(U^{up},s^{up}) - {}^c(U^{low},s^{low})J\ {}^c(U^{up},s^{up}). \tag{18}$$

Proof. Let G be the $\mathcal{C}$-graph of the poset P, whose local functions are determined by the matrix $I-J$. Let ω be induced by the reverse order of an arbitrary linear extension $W=w_1w_2\cdots w_N$ of P, i.e., ω is obtained from $W^{[r]}$ by replacing w_i with C_j if w_i belongs to C_j. Theorem 4.1 allows us to compute $(G,I-J,\omega)$ as follows: let $B={}^e(-J,s)$ with

rows and columns indexed by $s_{11}\cdots s_{1m_1}s_{21}\cdots$. The sequence $\bar{\omega}$ induced by ω is then $W^{[r]}$. By construction

$$[B_{\bar{\omega}}]_{s_{i_1j_1}s_{i_2j_2}} = \begin{cases} -1, & \text{if } s_{i_1j_1} \text{ appears before } s_{i_2j_2} \text{ in } W, \text{ and } C_{i_1} \text{ and } C_{i_2} \text{ are comparable;} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In other words, $I - B_{\bar{\omega}}$ is the matrix of the zeta function of P and $(I - B_{\bar{\omega}})^{-1}$ is the matrix of the Moebius function, U. According to Theorem 4.1 we have

$$(G, I - J, \omega) = I + {}^c((I - B_{\bar{\omega}})^{-1}, s)(-J + I - I) = I + {}^c(U, s)(-J).$$

Claim. $W = W_1W_2$, where $W_1 = w_1w_2\cdots w_l$ and $W_2 = w_{l+1}\cdots w_N$ and such that W_1 and W_2 are linear extensions of P^{low} and P^{up}, respectively.

This follows from the assumption that all P^{low}-elements are smaller than P^{up}-elements if they are comparable in P. Accordingly, the word ω can be split into two words ω_1 and ω_2 such that ω_i is induced by the reverse order of W_i, projecting into the corresponding clique-chains. The ω-update can be viewed as updating via ω_2 first and then updating via ω_1 and thus is tantamount to composing the linear SDS:

$$(G, A, \omega) = (G, A, \omega_1) \circ (G, A, \omega_2).$$

In complete analogy to the computation of (G, A, ω), we derive

$$(G, I - J, \omega_1) = I + {}^c(U^{low}, s^{low})(-J) \quad \text{and} \quad (G, I - J, \omega_2) = I + {}^c(U^{up}, s^{up})(-J).$$

We consequently arrive at the identity

$$I + {}^c(U, s)(-J) = (I + {}^c(U^{low}, s^{low})(-J))(I + {}^c(U^{up}, s^{up})(-J)).$$

The latter is equivalent to

$${}^c(U, s)J = {}^c(U^{low}, s^{low})J + {}^c(U^{up}, s^{up})J - {}^c(U^{low}, s^{low})J\ {}^c(U^{up}, s^{up})J,$$

whence the theorem. □

Acknowledgements

We thank Henning Mortveit and Matthew Macauley for their feedback and input on early results of this paper.

References

[1] J.A. Aledo, S.M. Sanahuja, J.C. Valverde, Updating method for the computation of orbits in parallel and sequential dynamical systems, Int. J. Comput. Math. 90(9) (2013), 1796-1808.

[2] C.L. Barrett, C.M. Reidys, Elements of a theory of simulation I, Appl. Math. Comput. 98 (1999), 241-259.

[3] C.L. Barrett, H.S. Mortveit, C.M. Reidys, Elements of a theory of simulation II: sequential dynamic systems, Appl. Math. Comput. 107 (2000), 121-136.

[4] C.L. Barrett, H.S. Mortveit, C.M. Reidys, Elements of a theory of simulation III: equivalence of SDS, Appl. Math. Comput. 122 (2001), 325-340.

[5] C.L. Barrett, H.S. Mortveit, C.M. Reidys, Elements of a theory of simulation IV: sequential dynamics systems: fixed points, invertibility and equivalence, Appl. Math. Comput. 134 (2003), 153-171.

[6] O. Colón-Reyes, R. Laubenbacher, B. Pareigis, Boolean monomial dynamic systems, Ann. Combin. 8 (2004), 425-439.

[7] W.Y.C. Chen, X. Li, J. Zheng, Matrix method for linear sequential dynamical systems on digraphs, Appl. Math. Comput., 160 (2005), 197-212.

[8] B. Elspas, The theory of autonomous linear sequential networks, IRE Transactions on Circuit Theory CT-6 (1959), 45-60.

[9] L. Garcia, A. Jarrah, and R. Laubenbacher, Sequential dynamical systems over words, Appl. Math. Comput., 174(1) (2006), 500-510.

[10] R.A. Hernández Toledo, Linear finite dynamical systems, Comm. Algebra, 33(9) (2005), 2977-2989.

[11] A. Jarrah, R. Laubenbacher, and P. Vera-Licona, An efficient algorithm for finding the phase space structure of linear finite dynamical systems, Preprint 2006.

[12] S.A. Kauffman, Metabolic stability and epigenesis in randomly constructed genetic nets, J. Theor. Biol. 22 (1969), 437-467.

[13] R. Lanbenbacher, B. Pareigis, Update schedules of sequential dynamical systems, Discrete Appl. Math. 30 (2003), 655-678.

[14] H.S. Mortveit, C.M. Reidys, An Introduction to Sequential Dynamic Systems, Springer, 2008.

[15] J. von Neumann, Theory of Self-Reproducing Automata, University of Illinois Press, Chicago, 1966.

[16] C.M. Reidys, On acyclic orientations and sequential dynamical systems, Adv. Appl. Math. 27 (2001), 790-804.

[17] C.M. Reidys, Sequential Dynamical Systems Over Words, Annals of Combinatorics 10(4) (2006), 481-498.

[18] C.M. Reidys, Combinatorics of Sequential Dynamical Systems, Discrete Math. (2007) 308:514-528.

[19] J. Reger, Linear Systems over Finite Fields—Modeling, Analysis, and Synthesis, PhD thesis, Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg, Erlangen 2004.

[20] R.P. Stanley, Enumerative Combinatorics, vol. 1, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1997.

[21] A.M. Turing, Rounding-off errors in matrix processes, Quart. J. Mech. Appl. Math., 1:287-308, 1948.

[22] L.N. Trefethen, David Bau, III, Numerical linear algebra, SIAM, 1997.

[23] S. Wolfram, Cellular Automata and Complexity, Addison-Wesley, New York, 1994.